

REMARKS

Claims 1, 15, and 37 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-4, 7, 15, 17-20, and 37-41 are pending.

Claim 1-4, 7, 15, 17-20 , and 37-41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, the claim has been amended to use specific language from paragraph 0045. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes, U.S. Patent No. 6,122,372, in view of Yeager, U.S. Patent No. 6,167,402.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, Hughes teaches encapsulating a business transaction message with verifiable data generated identifiers. As Hughes teaches, transaction messages including letters of credit, standby letters of credit, bills of lading, certificates of insurance, bankers acceptances, invoices, sight drafts, trust receipts, represent essential business relationships for import and export. Given the high importance associated with a transaction message, Hughes describes in Figure 2 and Figure 3 deriving a verifiable data generated identifier based on a cryptographic hash of a message set including a message body 212 (Hughes, column 3 lines 23-30). In contrast, claim 1 recites “computing a message tag from a *subset* of the plurality of *message properties*, including a message sender and a message submission time, *but not including an entire body of the message*” (emphasis added.) Deriving a verifiable data generated identifier based on a complete message set including the message body itself is different from computing a message tag based on a subset of message properties. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.


Claims 2-4 and 7, which depend from claim 1; claims 17-20, which depend from claim 15; and claims 38-41, which depend from claim 37 are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/17/08



Laura Ing
Registration No. 56,859
V 408-973-2581
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014